APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,243	08/20/2008	Gopi Kumar Bulusu	DAD-0021	8556

23353   7590   07/12/2011
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER
BLOOMQUIST, KEITH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/12/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/587,243	BULUSU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KEITH BLOOMQUIST	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10 August 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 July 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/26/2006</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an

application filed as a PCT on 1/28/2004. It is noted, however, that applicant has not

filed a certified copy of the PCT application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

3.   Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 5 recites a system, but lists components

which could all, in one embodiment, exist purely as software modules. The broadest

reasonable interpretation of Claim 5 therefore includes embodiment which are software

per se, and the claim is therefore not a process, machine, manufacture, or composition

of matter within the scope of the statute.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in
> public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in
> the United States.

5.   Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Richard, U.S. PGPUB No. 2002/0073119 ("Richard").

        Richard teaches a system and method for converting markup language

documents with data from multiple sources, into a document in one of several other

available formats. With regards to Claim 1, Richard teaches a method for transforming

a heterogeneous compound document to a desired format based on a prescribed model

comprising the steps of:

- (i) specifying the components of the heterogeneous compound document as
  a hierarchical tree structure in multiple formats and specifying the input
  sources of information for each of the components as part of the model
  ([0060], converter obtains heterogeneous data from various data sources;
  [0064] describes creation of a hierarchical tree structure assembled using
  references to nodes of the various input data sources);

- (ii) verifying and composing the heterogeneous compound document using a
  modeling language parser and a document composer by dynamically
  obtaining input information from the sources specified in the model ([0063],
  standardization interface creates trees of various input source documents by
  parsing the sources; [0064] describes the various trees of the various input
  source information being combined by a converter into a single representation
  of the compound document); and

- (iii) converting the input compound document to the desired format using the document composer ([0069] describes the converter converting the compound document into a desired format).

Claim 5 recites a system which carries out the methods of Claim 1; the identification of various types of nodes and syntax checking are well-known in the art and covered by the steps of Claim 1, and this claim is therefore rejected.

With regards to Claim 4, Richard teaches the step of converting the heterogeneous compound document to the desired format specified in the prescribed model carried out by:

- (i) providing a model of the compound document and the root element of the model matching with the input, and the output document format identifier as inputs ([0054]-[0056], modules obtain target device information as input to determine form of output; transformation module can apply a transformation script to the document. [0102] describes a conversion script being invoked upon reading root element of a HTML document referring to the input document);

- (ii) obtaining a value list corresponding to the output document format identifier from the root element ([0104]-[0108], navigation logic is called for use in conversion corresponding to the input in HTML form, and searches document tree for specified nodes based on the desired format);

- (iii) considering each value from the value list obtained and (a) outputting the value if the value obtained is a constant; (b) obtaining the value list

corresponding to the output document format identifier from the internal

element or leaf element, if the value is a reference to an internal node

element or leaf element and recursively repeating step (iii) for the new value

list ([0144], desired information located in document nodes is found and text

is output if constant text is found; [0120] describes values being obtained from

elsewhere using a redirect function if data is in a separate location. [0104]

and [0105] describe a recursive process whereby values for all nodes are

either obtained locally or found elsewhere until an entire document tree has

been analyzed).

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claims 2 and 3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

8.   Mani, et al., U.S. PGPUB No. 2004/0060003 teaches a system and method for

transforming markup language documents using a transformation template.

9.   Krupa, U.S. Patent No. 6,915,304 discloses a system and method for converting

a hierarchical document structure into a format compatible with a relational database.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEITH BLOOMQUIST whose telephone number is (571)270-7718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. B./   6/29/2011
Examiner, Art Unit 2178
/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178